

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Applicant(s) thank(s) the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Office action restricts the invention to one of the following groups of claims:

- I. Claims 1, 2, and 5-12, drawn to a method; and
- II. Claims 3, 4, and 13-15, drawn to a method.

In response, applicant(s) provisionally elect(s), with traverse, to prosecute claim(s) 1, 2, and 5-12, identified as species I, along with any newly added claims drawn to the same species. Applicant(s) reserve(s) the right to prosecute the subject matter of the non-elected claim(s) in a divisional or other continuing application.

Applicants' traversal is based at least on the fact that the device and the method for making it are so closely related that searching both the device and the method would not impose an undue burden on the Examiner.

MPEP § 803 - Restriction - When Proper

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

Additionally, the restriction requirement is not well founded because the Office action asserts that no species is directed to figure 4 and the other species is directed to figure 6. However, the restriction requirement may only be used to restrict respective embodiments of two different inventions, not claims that refer to different figures that are used to explain the same invention. The specification (page 3) explains that figures 3 and 4 help explain steps performed during manufacturer of the display device of figure 1, and that figures 5 and 6 show diagrammatically portions of the display device of figure 1. Accordingly, both figures are used in reference to the display device of figure 1. Therefore restriction is not proper and the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

New dependent claims are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

Withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of the application on its merits are now respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric M. Bram
Reg. 37,285
Att'y for Applicant(s)
Philips Intellectual Property
& Standards

P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9635
Fax: (914) 332-06150